Remarks

Claim Amendments: The examiner has rejected claims 1-9 for obviousness in view of 35 U.S.C. § 103. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection. However, the examiner has indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In order to expedite prosecution of this application, the applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 10. The applicant does not intend to surrender the subject matter of original claims 1-9. Rather, the applicant intends to pursue coverage commensurate with those claims in a continuation application.

Claim 10 has been cancelled because it is now redundant in view of amended claim 1. Additionally, claim 27 has been amended to change its dependency. Originally, claim 27 depended from claim 10. Because claim 10 has been cancelled, applicant has amended claim 27 so that it depends from claim 1. The foregoing amendments are believed to place all of the remaining claims in condition for allowance.

Information Disclosure Statement: The examiner has refused to consider the references cited in the applicant's information disclosure statement. While the applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's decision in this regard, rather than contest the issue, the applicant is resubmitting the information disclosure statement on PTO form SB/08a. The applicant is also submitting herewith a check in the amount of \$180. Because there has been no final action or other action closing prosecution, the applicant should be entitled to have the references considered by the examiner. MPEP § 609. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to consider the references submitted with the applicant's information disclosure statement.

Conclusion: The foregoing amendments and comments are believed to resolve all of the examiner's rejections. All of the remaining claims are believed to be allowable, and no other issue is believed to remain in the case. Therefore, an early notice of allowability is respectfully requested. However, if the examiner believes that a teleconference might resolve any issue that may remain, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Date: September 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bennett Ford, Jr. Registration No. 39,193

ROY, KIESEL, KEEGAN & DENICOLA

2355 Drusilla Lane

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809

(225) 927-9908

(225) 926-2685 (fax)

rbf@rkkdlaw.com